

ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS
Tuesday, March 16, 2010
6:30 P.M. – City Council Chambers
Rockford City Hall, 425 East State Street

Present:

ZBA Members: Aaron Magdziarz
Alicia Neubauer
Dan Roszkowski
Scott Sanders
Craig Sockwell

Absent: Julio Salgado

Staff: Todd Cagnoni - Deputy Director, Construction Services
Sandra Hawthorne – Administrative Assistant
Jon Hollander – City Engineer, Public Works
Mark Marinaro – Fire Prevention

Others: Alderman Bill Robertson (arrived at 7:30)
Kathy Berg, Stenographer
Applicants and Interested Parties

Sandra Hawthorne explained the format of the meeting will follow the Boards Rules of Procedure generally outlined as follows:

The Chairman will call the address of the application.

- The Applicant or representative are to come forward and be sworn in.
- The Applicant or representative will present their request before the Board
- The Board will ask any questions they may have regarding this application.
- The Chairman will then ask if there are any Objectors or Interested Parties. Objectors or Interested Parties are to come forward at that time, be sworn in by the Chairman, and give their name and address to the Zoning Board secretary and the stenographer
- The Objector or Interested Party will present all their concerns, objections and questions to the Applicant regarding the application.
- The Board will ask any questions they may have of the Objector or Interested Party.
- The Applicant will have an opportunity to rebut the concerns, answer questions of the Objector or Interested Party
- No further discussion from the Objector or Interested Party will occur after the rebuttal of the Applicant.
- The Board will then discuss the application and a vote will be taken.

It was further explained to the public in attendance, applicants, objectors and interested parties that this meeting is not a final vote on any item. The date of the Codes & Regulations meeting was given as Monday, March 29, 2010, at 4:30 PM in Conference Room A of this building as the second vote on these items. The public in attendance, applicants, objectors and interested parties were instructed that they could contact Sandra Hawthorne in the Zoning Office for future information and that her phone number was listed on the top of the agenda which was made available to all those in attendance at the beginning of the meeting. The City's web site address for minutes of this meeting are listed on the agenda as well.

A **MOTION** was made by Alicia to **APPROVE** the minutes of the February 17, 2010 meeting as submitted. The Motion was **SECONDED** by Craig Sockwell and **CARRIED** by a vote of 4-0, with Julio Salgado and Aaron Magdziarz abstaining as they were not in attendance at the February meeting.

003-10

Applicant
Ward 14

1310 Esmond Drive

Atty. Sherry Harlan for Diane Patten

Variation to reduce the required 60 foot front yard setback per the subdivision plat to 46 feet 8 inches in an R-1, Single-family Residential District

The subject property is located on the cul-de-sac of Esmond Drive and is a single-family residence. Diane Patten and Attorney Sherry Harlan were present. Attorney Harlan stated 6 houses on this cul-de-sac are set back 60 feet, which is further back than required by code. The applicant wishes to build a 16 x 20 foot garage in the front yard. There will be a garage door on either side as well as windows in the front and sides with window plant boxes. The windows in the front of the garage itself will match the windows of the house. The Applicant built an addition to the rear of the house in 2006 to provide an additional bedroom and bath to allow her parents to live with her. Attorney Harlan went on to explain that Mrs. Patten's father has since had a stroke and is wheelchair bound. In order to get him in and out of the garage and their vehicle, it is necessary to submit him to the outside elements. Mrs. Patten has had a Home Occupation license for a salon for several years, allowing her to work out of her home. Her customers will also enter from the side door of the proposed garage.

In response to letters of objection submitted, Attorney Harlan presented photos of the neighboring properties. She pointed out that the neighbor to the north has no windows on that side of the home so there is no sight to obscure. The neighbors to the south are on the other side of a fence lined with trees so this sight line would not be affected. The current landscaping will not change and the fence will not be removed. Regarding the concern for drainage, Attorney Harlan explained the water now comes down from the roof and out to the street, and will continue to flow in this manner after the addition. This construction will take approximately a month so will not interfere with the neighborhood to a large degree. Attorney Harlan stated the encroachment into the front area is for the safety of her father. She added the installation of window boxes on the garage will also enhance the structure.

Alicia Neubauer stated there is a foundation plan and site plan in the packet; however she is unclear as to why the garage needs to come out past the existing garage. Mr. Roszkowski explained this additional room is necessary for the wheelchair to get out of the van and roll down the side. Attorney Harlan stated there are no other doors large enough for a wheelchair and any outside entrances would still expose her father to the elements.

Mr. Sanders stated this certainly is an understandable case; but he feels cul-de-sac lots need to have a larger setback because the front of the lot gets smaller as it progresses to the cul-de-sac. He can understand that it does appear to make some of the houses stand back from the Applicant's with the proposed plan.

Staff Recommendation was for Approval with 1 condition. Letters of Objection were included in the Zoning Report and Objectors were present.

Ted Badell, 1314 Esmond Drive, adjacent property directly south of the Applicant's property, stated when the original addition was built on the back of the house, he allowed the Applicant 5 feet of his property to accommodate this construction. However, he is opposed to the application presented at this time.

Lucy Hulvey, 1322 Esmond Drive, 3 lots to the south, stated she feels the cul-de-sac does not need to be changed from a 60 foot frontage to a 45 foot frontage. She is concerned that this will encourage other neighbors to do the same. She also expressed concern with water flow from this property.

Xaysana Nouane, 1306 Esmond Drive, adjacent property to the north also expressed concern with drainage and traffic flow.

In response, Attorney Harlan stated the front garage will have no issues with the back yard drainage. Drainage problems have occurred in this area prior to the original addition to the home. This drainage will flow directly to the drain in the street. Attorney Harlan expressed that sometimes there are reasons for varying the ordinance and she encouraged the Board to see that this is extremely important to her family, particularly the needs of the Applicant's mother and father. She further stated the garage will be at least built out to the setback to accommodate their needs.

Mr. Sanders did not feel there would be a drainage risk as pavement is already in the front of this property. Mr. Roszkowski stated if the drainage issues are in the back yard, drainage does not have any effect on this application.

Mr. Cagnoni stated the City knows this subdivision does have problems with drainage. The subdivision goes back to 1977 and is in a relatively low area. He stated Staff's Recommendation of Approval was from a practical approach in regards to the building setback line. This lot has a 60 foot setback as well as some other lots in the cul-de-sac. However, the lot adjacent to the west and across the street each have 30 foot setbacks. This was taken into consideration when looking at this request. Mr. Cagnoni further explained that Staff had asked the Applicant to chalk out the outline of the building when they did a site visit and Staff felt the lots to the east and west were not visually impaired. Staff engineered a line to visually determine how much of the proposed structure would impose that visual corridor and felt it was a small portion of the building addition.

Mr. Roszkowski stated the property across the street has a six foot fence that goes down to Newburg right in the front yard setback which already obscures view from that point. Mr. Cagnoni stated this lot was pre-existing and was not a part of the subdivision.

A **MOTION** was made by Aaron Magdziarz to **APPROVE** the Variation to reduce the required 60 foot front yard setback per the subdivision plat to 46 feet 8 inches in an R-1, Single-family Residential District at 1310 Esmond Drive. The Motion was **SECONDED** by Craig Sockwell. With Scott Sanders and Alicia Neubauer voting Nay, The Board was unable to obtain 4 positive votes which resulted in a recommendation of **DENIAL**.

ZBA 003-10
Findings of Fact for a Variation
To Reduce the Required 60' Front Yard Setback
Per the Subdivision Plat to 46'8"
In an R-1, Single-Family Residential Zoning District at
1310 Esmond Drive

Denial of this Variation is based upon the following findings:

1. Because of the particular physical surroundings, shape, or topographical conditions of the specific property involved, a particular hardship to the owner would not result, as distinguished from a mere inconvenience, if the strict letter of the regulations were to be carried out.
2. The conditions upon which a petition for this Variation are based are not unique to the property for which the Variation is sought and are applicable, generally, to other property within the same zoning classification.
3. The purpose of this Variation is based exclusively upon a desire to increase the value or income potential of the property.

4. The alleged difficulty or hardship is not caused by this Ordinance and has been created by any persons presently having an interest in the property or by any predecessor in title.
5. The granting of this Variation will be detrimental to the public welfare, or injurious to other property or improvements in the neighborhood in which the property is located.
6. The proposed Variation will impair an adequate supply of light and air to adjacent property, or substantially increase the congestion of the public streets, or increase the danger of fire, or endanger the public safety, or substantially diminish or impair the property values within the neighborhood.
7. The proposed Variation does not comply with the spirit and intent of restrictions imposed by this Ordinance.

005-10

Applicant
Ward 11

920 1st Avenue

Robert Bauer

Special Use Permit to allow the installation of up to three small wind turbines as permitted obstructions in a C-4, Urban Mixed Use District

The subject property is located on the north side of 1st Avenue and 55 feet west of South 6th Street and is currently being used as engineering offices and personal vehicle maintenance. Robert Bauer, Applicant, reviewed his request for Special Use Permit. Mr. Bauer stated the engineering business has been tapering off and he is looking to diversify by marketing, selling, and installation of wind turbines. These turbines are bat and bird friendly, and they have a low decibel level. He explained the sound level would be similar to that of a refrigerator running. In reference to paving the lot as stated in Staff's conditions, he asked for a two year extension to complete paving. Mr. Bauer is willing to do landscaping, but wishes to eliminate the shade trees, stating they will interfere with the turbines.

Staff Recommendation was for Approval with 3 conditions. No Objectors or Interested Parties were present.

Mr. Sanders stated he has some concerns with site improvements. Mr. Cagnoni stated Staff was not in agreement with a two year time frame for paving, but understands the concern with trees. Staff is willing to work with the Applicant on landscaping requirements. Mr. Sanders explained a shade tree can grow up to 40 feet, depending on the species. Mr. Roszkowski felt an 18 month window on paving would allow the Applicant two paving seasons to pave the lot. The Board felt Staff and the Applicant could work out a landscaping plan that would satisfy code requirements.

A **MOTION** was made by Scott Sanders to **APPROVE** the Special Use Permit to allow the installation of up to three small wind turbines as permitted obstructions in a C-4, Urban Mixed Use District at 920 1st Avenue. The Motion was **SECONDED** by Craig Sockwell and **CARRIED** by a vote of 5-0.

Approval is subject to the following conditions:

1. Meeting all applicable building and fire codes.
2. Submittal of final elevation plans with proposed locations of wind turbines for Staff review and approval.
3. Submittal of a parking lot permit, including site improvement of blacktop or concrete inclusive of providing landscaping along 1st Avenue for Staff review and approval.
4. Parking lot to be paved within 18 months of City Council approval of this item
5. Applicant to work with Staff on further modification of landscaping requirements to allow ornamental trees in place of shade trees where applicable.

ZBA 005-10
Findings of Fact for a Special Use Permit
To Allow the Installation of up to Three (3) Small Wind turbines
As Permitted Obstructions in a C-4, Urban Mixed Use Zoning District at
920 1st Avenue

Approval of this Special Use Permit is based upon the following findings:

1. The establishment, maintenance or operation of the Special Use Permit will not be detrimental to or endanger the public health, safety, morals, comfort or general welfare of the community.
2. The Special Use Permit will not be injurious to the use and enjoyment of other property in the immediate vicinity for the purposes already permitted, nor substantially diminish and impair property values within the neighborhood.
3. The establishment of the special use will not impede the normal or orderly development and improvement of the surrounding property for uses permitted in the C-4 district.
4. Adequate utilities, access roads, drainage and/or necessary facilities have been provided.
5. Adequate measures have been or will be taken to provide ingress or egress so designed as to minimize traffic congestion in the public streets.
6. The special use shall, in all other respects, conform to the applicable regulations of the C-4 Zoning District in which it is located.

006-10

Applicant
Ward 7

3509 Auburn Street

Noah Sanders / Sanders Brother Realty

Special Use Permit for passenger vehicle sales in conjunction with tire installation/sales and an auto repair shop

Variation to reduce the required landscaping as per submitted site plan

Variation to reduce required parking spaces from 19 to 4 in a C-3, General Commercial Zoning District

The subject property is located on the north side of Auburn Street, 1,000 feet east of the Auburn Street and Central Avenue intersection and is currently a tire installation/sales and auto repair shop.

Randy Sanders, co-owner of the auto repair shop reviewed his application. Mr. Sanders stated their business has been very successful and they wish to add the sale of used passenger vehicle sales as well. Mr. Sanders asked if he had read the Staff report. Mr. Sanders stated he is agreeable to Staff conditions and that he has also spoken with Alderman Thompson-Kelly.

Staff Recommendation was for Approval of all three requests, with 9 conditions. No Objectors or Interested Parties were present.

A **MOTION** was made by Alicia Neubauer to **APPROVE** the Special Use Permit for passenger vehicle sales in conjunction with tire installation/sales and an auto repair shop; **APPROVE** the Variation to reduce the required landscaping as per submitted site plan; and **APPROVE** the Variation to reduce required parking spaces from 19 to 4 in a C-3, General Commercial Zoning District at 3509 Auburn Street. The Motion was **SECONDED** by Scott Sanders and **CARRIED** by a vote of 5-0.

Approval is subject to the following conditions:

1. Meeting all Building and Fire Codes.
2. Submittal of Building Permits for Staff review and approval.
3. Submittal of a parking lot permit application and site plan proposal by professional engineer for Staff review and approval.
4. Submittal of revised detailed landscape plan to include the type of species to be planted along with curbed landscaping along Auburn Street and around additional interior landscaping for Staff's review and approval.
5. The outdoor sale of passenger vehicles shall be limited to five (5) vehicles at one time.
6. No parking or development on city property without a Lease Agreement.
7. Removal of all new asphalt in right-of-way.
8. Install a new sidewalk along Auburn Street.
9. All conditions must be met before establishment of vehicle sales.

ZBA 006-10
Findings of Fact for a Special Use Permit
For Passenger Vehicle Sales in Conjunction with Tire Installation/Sales
And An Auto Repair Shop
In a C-3, General Commercial Zoning District at
3509 Auburn Street

Approval of this Special Use Permit is based upon the following findings:

1. The establishment, maintenance or operation of the Special Use Permit will not be detrimental to or endanger the public health, safety, morals, comfort or general welfare of the community.
2. The Special Use Permit will not be injurious to the use and enjoyment of other property in the immediate vicinity for the purposes already permitted, nor substantially diminish and impair property values within the neighborhood.
3. The establishment of the special use will not impede the normal or orderly development and improvement of the surrounding property for uses permitted in the district.
4. Adequate utilities, access roads, drainage and/or necessary facilities have been provided.
5. Adequate measures have been or will be taken to provide ingress or egress so designed as to minimize traffic congestion in the public streets.
6. The special use shall, in all other respects, conform to the applicable regulations of the C-3 Zoning District in which it is located.

ZBA 006-10
Findings of Fact for a Variation
To Reduce Required Landscaping as Per Submitted Site Plan
In a C-3, General Community Zoning District at
3509 Auburn Street

Approval of this Variation is based upon the following findings:

1. Because of the particular physical surroundings, shape, or topographical conditions of the specific property involved, a particular hardship to the owner would result, as distinguished from a mere inconvenience, if the strict letter of the regulations were to be carried out.
2. The conditions upon which a petition for this Variation are based are unique to the property for which the Variation is sought and are not applicable, generally, to other property within the same zoning classification.
3. The purpose of this Variation is not based exclusively upon a desire to increase the value or income potential of the property.
4. The alleged difficulty or hardship is caused by this Ordinance and has not been created by any persons presently having an interest in the property or by any predecessor in title.
5. The granting of this Variation will not be detrimental to the public welfare, or injurious to other property or improvements in the neighborhood in which the property is located.
6. The proposed Variation will not impair an adequate supply of light and air to adjacent property, or substantially increase the congestion of the public streets, or increase the danger of fire, or endanger the public safety, or substantially diminish or impair the property values within the neighborhood.
7. The proposed Variation does comply with the spirit and intent of restrictions imposed by this Ordinance.

ZBA 006-10
Findings of Fact for a Variation
To Reduce the Required Parking Spaces From 19 to 4
In a C-3, General Community Zoning District at
3509 Auburn Street

Approval of this Variation is based upon the following findings:

1. Because of the particular physical surroundings, shape, or topographical conditions of the specific property involved, a particular hardship to the owner would result, as distinguished from a mere inconvenience, if the strict letter of the regulations were to be carried out.
2. The conditions upon which a petition for this Variation are based are unique to the property for which the Variation is sought and are not applicable, generally, to other property within the same zoning classification.
3. The purpose of this Variation is not based exclusively upon a desire to increase the value or income potential of the property.

4. The alleged difficulty or hardship is caused by this Ordinance and has not been created by any persons presently having an interest in the property or by any predecessor in title.
5. The granting of this Variation will not be detrimental to the public welfare, or injurious to other property or improvements in the neighborhood in which the property is located.
6. The proposed Variation will not impair an adequate supply of light and air to adjacent property, or substantially increase the congestion of the public streets, or increase the danger of fire, or endanger the public safety, or substantially diminish or impair the property values within the neighborhood.
7. The proposed Variation does comply with the spirit and intent of restrictions imposed by this Ordinance.

054-09

Applicant
Ward 6

1277 Asche Avenue

David Jenkins

Special Use Permit for a Planned Unit Development for a Multi-family Residential Development consisting of 158 units on one lot in a C-3, General Commercial Zoning District
Laid Over from January & February
Revised for March meeting

A letter was received from the Applicant's attorney prior to this meeting requesting that this item be Laid Over to the April 20th meeting.

A **MOTION** was made by Scott Sanders to **LAY OVER** the Special Use Permit for a Planned Unit Development for a Multi-family Residential Development consisting of 158 units on one lot in a C-3, General Commercial Zoning District at 1277 Asche Avenue. The Motion was **SECONDED** by Craig Sockwell and **CARRIED** by a vote of 5-0.

056-09

Applicant
Ward 12

3600 North Main Street

Cynthia R. Shutkas

Special Use Permit for used passenger vehicle sales in a C-2, Limited Commercial Zoning District
Laid Over from January & February

Prior to the meeting, a written request was received from the Applicant requesting that this item be Laid Over to the April 20th meeting.

A **MOTION** was made by Scott Sanders to **LAY OVER** the Special Use Permit for used passenger vehicle sales in a C-2, Limited Commercial Zoning District at 3600 North Main Street. The Motion was **SECONDED** by Craig Sockwell and **CARRIED** by a vote of 5-0.

ZBA 002-10

Applicant
Ward 6

5444 11th Street

Debra Palka / Palka Trucking, Inc.

Modification of Special Use Permit #059-06 from outside storage of tractor equipment for sale / rent to outside storage of truck and trailer in conjunction with a trucking business in an I-1, Light industrial Zoning District
Referred Back to ZBA from Codes & Regulations Committee

This item was heard at the February Zoning Board of Appeals meeting and was approved subject to 9 conditions. At that meeting, the Applicant, Debra Palka, was asked if she was in agreement with Staff conditions of Approval and had stated she was. Prior to the Codes and Regulations Committee meeting, the Applicant submitted a written request to eliminate condition 9 which states *"Any parking or storage surface must be asphalt or concrete"*. Based on the request to eliminate this condition, Codes and Regulations referred this item back to the Zoning Board of Appeals for their recommendation. Mr. Keith Bradle was present to review the application. Mr. Bradle stated their trucks would be coming out once in the morning and returning back at night, with the exceptions of double shifts. He also felt all of the conditions of approval have been completed with the exception of the paving. Regarding condition 4 requesting submittal of a landscaping plan, Mr. Bradle felt all of the landscaping had been done 3 years ago. He stated there are existing trees that have been there for three years. Mr. Bradle stated they should not have to blacktop this area due to the economy. He stated there are other areas who run trucks in and out and they do not have blacktop surfaces. He has about 50 or 55 owner/operators who do not park at the facility. There are 7 company trucks that will be going out in the morning and back in the evening. Mr. Magdziarz was concerned with leakage into the ground from the trucks sitting on an unpaved surface. Mr. Bradle stated they would be willing to cover the lot with stone which would take about a month to complete. He also suggested putting in road mill, which is blacktop that is broken up. This would then be rolled and sealed. Mr. Bradle stated the front of the office is already blacktopped; the fenced in area is stone. They have a security system and lights in the fenced in area. He further clarified they will be doing 90% of their own truck repairs unless it is a major repair. Mr. Sanders stated he had some frustration because at the February Zoning Board meeting Mr. Sanders specifically asked the Applicant if all conditions were agreeable and the Applicant responded that they were. Now the Applicant is coming back to remove and change conditions of paving and landscaping.

Mr. Roszkowski asked Mr. Bradle what type of fence was in place – Mr. Bradle replied that it was chain link.

Mr. Cagnoni stated he would be happy to go over the Staff report and recommendations. He explained the report was prepared in such a way as to be consistent with other businesses in Rockford. Staff has been working with the Applicant on a number of issues on this property. A complaint was received of work being done without a permit. The City went out to the property on numerous occasions to try to do an inspection but was not granted access. He further explained the site plan attached to this application is an original site plan provided by the previous owner when they applied for a Special Use Permit in 2006. This property needs to be brought into Federal Regulations for flood control. Regarding Variation for asphalt and concrete, Staff's recommendations in the past, as well as that of City Council's, have been limited to a paved surface. He explained that typically Variations to paving are supported only for heavy equipment or heavy steel and he estimated there were probably only 3 or 4 of those. He gave examples of Lowes, and Dayton Freight, Trucking Company who are recent developments and have had to come into compliance with landscaping and paving requirements. RAP (Recycled Asphalt Product) as described by Mr. Bradle is not permitted in the City of Rockford. There was one deviation in Harrison Park where there is an access drive to the road to Mulford Quarry. Mr. Bradle asked if they could lease the property for 3 years and then if they decide to purchase they could pave at that time. Mr. Sanders pointed out to the Applicant that a previous application at this meeting was told they would not be allowed to extend paving for as long as two years, so the Board would not consider a longer time period of three years. He stated he would not be comfortable with any time frame longer than an 18 month extension.

Mr. Hollander stated the entire area is designated a flood plain by FEMA and that it truly does flood. This is one of the reason Dayton Freight moved because they were unable to obtain a letter of map revision and they could not improve upon the property. Based on this, Alicia asked if this type of business at this location was appropriate and would it flood more if paving created more impervious surface. Mr. Hollander stated there really is not much difference between pavement and recycled asphalt in regards to water runoff. Mr. Cagnoni stated some of the situations are not related to the Applicant's proposal. If this were a vacant piece of property, staff would not propose to put a building or parking lot at this location. However, it has been developed with a building and gravel lot and that is what Staff is addressing at this time.

Staff Recommendation remains at Approval with the original 9 conditions. However, they would be agreeable to an 18 month extension on paving if the Board so chose. No Objectors or Interested Parties were present.

Mr. Sockwell stated he has experienced this situation himself when he had a trucking company and he was forced to pave prior to starting his business. He understands that paving cost are high. Mr. Sanders stated he is not comfortable with approving a gravel area. It is not consistent with past practices. Mr. Roszkowski voiced his agreement.

A **MOTION** was made by Scott Sanders to **APPROVE** the Modification of Special Use Permit #059-06 from outside storage of tractor equipment for sale / rent to outside storage of truck and trailer in conjunction with a trucking business in an I-1, Light industrial Zoning District at 5444 11th Street with a modification of an 18 month time limit to condition 9. The Motion was **SECONDED** by Aaron Magdziarz and **CARRIED** by a vote of 5-0.

Approval is subject to the following conditions:

1. Meeting all Building and Fire Codes
2. Submittal of Building Permits for Staff review and approval
3. Submittal of a detailed site plan
4. Submittal of detailed landscape plan to include the type of species to be planted for Staff's review and approval
5. Any addition to the gravel area and/or addition to the building will require the submittal of engineered drawings for FEMA and Staff's review and approval
6. A letter of Map Revision (LOMR) for the flood plain from FEMA for any expansion of the gravel area as indicated on site plan Exhibit D
7. A letter of Map Revision (LOMR) for the flood plain from FEMA for any addition to the building
8. The site is limited to the storage of trucks and trailers
9. Any parking or storage surface must be asphalt or concrete within 18 months of City Council approval of this item.

ZBA 002-10
Findings of Fact for a Modification of Special Use Permit #059-06
From Outside Storage of Tractor Equipment For Sale/Rent
To Outside Storage of Truck and Trailer
In Conjunction with a Trucking Business
In an I-1, Light Industrial Zoning District at
5444 11th Street

Approval of this Special Use Permit is based upon the following findings:

1. The establishment, maintenance or operation of the Special Use Permit will not be detrimental to or endanger the public health, safety, morals, comfort or general welfare of the community.
2. The Special Use Permit will not be injurious to the use and enjoyment of other property in the immediate vicinity for the purposes already permitted, nor substantially diminish and impair property values within the neighborhood.
3. The establishment of the special use will not impede the normal or orderly development and improvement of the surrounding property for uses permitted in the district.
4. Adequate utilities, access roads, drainage and/or necessary facilities have been provided.

5. Adequate measures have been or will be taken to provide ingress or egress so designed as to minimize traffic congestion in the public streets.
6. The special use shall, in all other respects, conform to the applicable regulations of the I-1 Zoning District in which it is located.

With no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 8:00 PM

Respectfully submitted,
Sandra A. Hawthorne
Administrative Assistant
Zoning Board of Appeals